JTA 3.0 D3 MASTER CHANGE REQUEST DATABASE (BY SPONSOR)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
ADHOC 2124	3.0 D3	2.1.2.1	Page 15, change date of DoD Technical Refernce Model Version 1.0 document from “15 July 1999” to “5 November 1999,” page 15.	Latest version of the document needs to be referenced.		A (Accept) 11/15/99 ========== By direction of TASG	Paul Fang; paul.fang@js.pentagon.mil	Paul Fang; paul.fang@js.pentagon.mil
ADHOC 2125	3.0 D3	2.1.2.1	Page 16, remove “Support” from “System Support Services” labels in Services View and Interfaces View portions of Figure 2.1-1: DoD Technical Reference Model (DoD TRM), page 16.	Consistency with similar graphic in 5 November 1999 version of DoD TRM document.		A (Accept) 11/15/99 ========== By direction of TASG	Paul Fang; paul.fang@js.pentagon.mil	Paul Fang; paul.fang@js.pentagon.mil
ADHOC 2126	3.0 D3	2.2.2.2.1._ 11.2	Page 36, first bullet in this section must be revised to delete the extraneous “1 February 1998” date. The final text should read: “OMG document formal/98-12-01, Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification, Version 2.3, June 1999.”	The listed date was derived from the previous version of CORBA, Version 2.2, and has been updated.		A (Accept) 11/15/99 ========== By direction of TASG	David Wheeler; dwheeler@ida.org	David Wheeler; dwheeler@ida.org
ADHOC 2127	3.0 D3	APP B	Page 241, Section 2.2.2.2.1.11.2, Distributed-Object Computing, revise wording of first standard to read: “OMG document formal/98-12-01, Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification, Version 2.3, June 1999.”	Consistency with resolution of ADHOC 2126.		A (Accept) 11/15/99 ========== By direction of TASG	David Wheeler; dwheeler@ida.org	David Wheeler; dwheeler@ida.org
ARMY 1820	3.0 D2	1.0 OASD Rewrite	Do not make proposed changes to Section 1, that were presented late at the TASG on 30 SEP 1999.	The significant changes add and modify V2.0 memo policy statements from the JTA V2.0 Implementation Memorandum. Policy must be included in policy documents, not architecture documents. Policy must be decided on at the appropriate higher level and included in the Implementation Memo or other policy document, not in the JTA document. The JTADG addresses JTA content in every revision cycle. The JTADG is not the appropriate forum to decide policy. Policy discussions at the JTADG level always result in wasted time and resources. The proposed changes do not have to be		AR (Accept Revised) 11/01/1999 ========== Accept only Section 1.1.5.4 contained in OASD Section 1.0 rewrite with the following change in the last sentence of the paragraph: "form" to "are incorporated into." The paragraph title should read: "1.1.5.4 Relationship Between the C4ISR Architecture Framework 2.0 and the DoD JTA." The paragraph text should read: "The C4ISR Architecture Framework (CAF)	Alex Osborne alex.osborne@hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne@hdqa.army.mil

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				made to this version on the document since the correct/approved policy is in the JTA V2.0 Implementation Memo. Significant detailed comments are also provided with this comment.		defines the technical architecture view and a set of standard products for DoD use. The JTA is one of the Universal Reference Resources named in the CAF. The JTA is the primary source document to the essential and supporting Technical Architecture products defined in the C4ISR Architecture Framework. Standards chosen from the JTA and other sources to meet system and operational requirements are incorporated into the Technical Architecture View."		
ARMY 1822	3.0 D2	1.0 OASD Rewrite	In the list: return 'Standardized Information-transfer products' back to 'Information-transfer assets'.	Assets provide seamless communications based on the standards in the JTA. Products are identified in the Systems Architecture. The goal of the JTA is not products but is interoperable assets.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1823	3.0 D2	1.1.3 OASD Rewrite	Delete first two paragraphs starting with 'The use of applicable mandated standards is required'.	Policy must be included in policy documents, not architecture documents. This is policy from the JTA V2.0 Implementation Memo. Policy can not be decided at the JTADG and TASG level. Keep policy in the Implementation Memo as we agreed over the past four years.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1824	3.0 D2	1.1.3 OASD Rewrite	Add back in the approved comment text from Army 1422. 'Additional standards may be required to meet system requirements.'	JTADG approved text based on Army 1422. Deleting the text without JTADG approval is breaking the configuration management process.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1825	3.0 D2	1.3 OASD	Remove the definition sentence for legacy	The definition is incorrect.		OBE	Alex Osborne	Alex Osborne

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
		Rewrite	standards starting with 'Legacy standards are'.	Legacy standards are not based on legacy systems. The 'Legacy standards' term is not used in this document.		(Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1826	3.0 D2	1.3 OASD Rewrite	Remove last 3 paragraphs starting with 'Each DoD Component and cognizant OSD authority is responsible'.	Policy must be included in policy documents, not architecture documents. Policy and waiver direction must not be added to the document. The last paragraph is different/changed policy than what is in JTA V2.0 Implementation Memo. 'Review all requests for waiver within respective domains' is not defined; domain in this document does not reflect DoD structure. 'Administratively coordinate through the established mechanism' is the approved wording. DMSO's process is not approved process to submit 'through the M&S management office of the responsible DoD Component. The waiver can not go around the DoD Component.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1827	3.0 D2	1.0 OASD Rewrite	Do not use proposed Figure 1-1.	The changes to the figure from the original figure in JTA V3.0, dated 3 SEP 1999, are not consistent with the JTA. It looks more like the DII COE. 'Information Process' block is not what is in Section 2.2. Common Support Apps, Infrastructure Services and kernel are not developed in the JTA. User Interfaces are not in Section 2.3, Information Transfer. Many of the communication links (lightning bolts) are		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				missing. The original figure best shows environment as it relates to the JTA.				
ARMY 1828	3.0 D2	1.1.5 OASD Rewrite	Do not use proposed Figure 1-2.	The proposed figure does not show the relationships between the OA, TA and SA. The following text is built around the original figure. Many of the matrixed concepts are not discussed in the JTA for the 'Technical' slice such as CADM, SHADE and LISI.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1831	3.0 D2	1.2.1 OASD Rewrite	In ARMY 1395 (Accept Revision on 6/21/1999). Do not delete, but add at end of sentence, 'without a waiver.' Add the following sentence: 'Emerging standards without competing mandated standards may be used but at risk.'	Accepted at JTADG.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1835	3.0 D2	2.3.2.1.1.1 .2.1	ARMY 1760: Adds the pointer to 2.2.2.2.1.11.1 but not in text.	JTADG approved comment.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1836	3.0 D2	2.4.1.3	ARMY 1763: Second paragraph, second sentence is not the accepted text, 'The primary product of each activity model is the definition of a measurable set of products, services, and information required to support the mission area function.'	JTADG approved comment.		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1837	3.0 D2	2.4.2.5.2.1	ARMY 1400: Incomplete date. Left out day of month.	This occurs several times in document, that is the truncation of the date. In the future, need full date and titles for mandates as accepted by the JTADG.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1838	3.0 D2	CS.1.1	USAF 84: Accepted text not added. 'The goals for the combat support domain annex are : 1) improve applications interoperability, promote improved business practices, and reduce operations costs within the combat support domain, and 2) improve interoperability and increase combat support information access with C4ISR systems.'	JTADG approved comment.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1839	3.0 D2	CS.1.1	USAF 83: Accepted text not added. 'The Combat Support (CS) Domain Annex was	JTADG approved comment.		OBE (Overcome by Events)	Alex Osborne alex.osborne	Alex Osborne alex.osborne

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			developed to provide agile combat support elements and other domains a common technical architecture with which to integrate.'			11/01/1999 ==========	@hdqa.army.mil	@hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1840	3.0 D2	2.2.2.2.1	Update list of 7 primary system support services and operating systems services to 11 as stated in 2.2.2.2.	Re-organizing paragraphs was not reflected in 2.2.2.2.1 after 2.2.2.2.2 was deleted. Note that the JTADG database does not record that 2.2.2.2.2 Application Platform Cross-Area Services should be deleted.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1841	3.0 D2	2.2.2.2.1.4 .6.1.4	Add back in Section 2.2.2.2.1.4.6.1.4 Audio for Video Support that was deleted.	The 4th bullet in Section 2.2.2.2.1.4.6.1 still references this subject. There is no record in the JTADG database to delete this paragraph has two mandates.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1842	3.0 D2	2.2.2.2.1.7	Add back in the word 'POSIX'. Section 2.2.2.2.1.7, 1st paragraph, last sentence: the text 'Portable Operating System Interface (POSIX)' was deleted between 'standard' and 'or Win32 APIs.'	Currently, the standard APIs are not defined. No record in the JTADG database calls for POSIX to be deleted.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1843	3.0 D2	2.4.1.2	1st line, after 'data models, ' insert 'object models'	To incorporate approved change Army 1756 as it existed in the approved JTADG Draft 1.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1844	3.0 D2	2.4.1.3	Comment: 3rd line, replace 'activity models and data models are two basic types of models frequently created.' with 'there are three basic types of models frequently created: activity, data, and object.'	To incorporate approved change Army 1598 as it existed in the approved JTADG Draft 1.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1845	3.0 D2	2.4.1.3	Comment: In 4th para. Change 'Object models' to 'Object Models' and use bold type.	Change to make consistent with previous 2 paragraphs.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1846	3.0 D2	2.4.2.1	In mandated standard, make sure the '-' is between 'Language' and 'Syntax'.	Change to accurately reflect standard name as it was in previous draft. The comparison version did not have it.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1847	3.0 D2	2.4.2.2	Remove DoD Manual 8320.1-M-1 from mandated standards and change wording of previous para. from 'The mandated standards are:' to 'The mandated standard	To incorporate approved change Army 1605 as it existed in the approved JTADG Draft 1. DoD Manual		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			is:'	8320.1-M-1 is mandated in Para.2.4.2.3. Also see Adhoc 2086.				
ARMY 1848	3.0 D2	2.4.2.3	After 1st sentence, insert the following sentences: 'Tactical systems must incorporate applicable C2 Core Data Model (C2CDM) elements. The C2CDM is a subset of the DDM.'	Implement the approved comment Army 1362 which somehow got lost. Note this section was moved/renumbered. This is the only place where reference to the C2CDM is retained, since other references were removed. This is a critical mandate for interoperability on the battlefield, which includes C2 and Intelligence. The Army considers this as a high priority mandate.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil
ARMY 1849	3.0 D2	2.4.3.1	Undelete para 2.4.3.1 'Object Modeling' as existed in previous draft.	The JTADG meeting of 5 August resulted in the inclusion of this paragraph as modified at the meeting and agreed to by the membership. See Army 1783, 1420 and 1419.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil
ARMY 1850	3.0 D2	2.4.3.1	In 3rd subparagraph of reinserted Object Modeling para., insert a '-' between 'Language' and 'Syntax' of emerging standard IEEE 1320.2-1998.	Change to accurately reflect standard name.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil
ARMY 1863	3.0 D2	2.3.2.1.1.1	Modify and move 2.3.2.1.1.1 Application-Support Services to 2.1.2.2.1. Changes to the 3 Sep 1999 JTA do not reflect the results of the 3 Aug 1999 JTADG: ' 2.3.2.1.1.1 Application-Support Services, Several systems and standards use windowing as a Year 2000 remediation technique. It is especially important to note that the ACP publication series will be using a pivot year of '05', forcing systems to use a 4-digit year by the year 2006. Otherwise the year '06' will be interpreted as 1906 rather than 2006.' This narrative should be removed from 2.3.2.1.1.1, modified to the agreed to narrative, and placed in Section 2.1.2.2.1.	KEF1 indicated that according to the 6/11/99 database, the statement above should have been inserted in the JTA. The 6/30 database printout which was used during the JTADG Section 2.3 meeting on 3 Aug 1999 indicated that it was D (Do not Accept), but it was considered an open item, which was discussed and resolved during the meeting. To the best of my recollection, the following occurred at the JTADG Section 2.3 meeting on 3		AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== Section titled "2.3.2.1.1.1 Application-Support Services" should read: "For Year 2000 remediation issues, including ACP publications, see Section 2.1.2.2.1."	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				Aug 1999: a) DISA had recommended several Y2K comments for inclusion in Section 2.3 (e.g. DMS, GPS sections) as 'in addition to' the Y2K mandates already in the JTA (Section 2.4.2.3.1 DoD Date Standards, and Section 2.1.4.1 Y2K Compliance policy narrative). The proposed comments were to force the users of ACP publication (e.g. 123) to act with regard to Y2K. DISA had recognized that the date/time group of the ACP publication posed a problem due to its use of a 2-digit year. The comment reflected the MCEB recommended interim solution, and since no other document could be found to put it in, the recommendation was to include it in Section 2.3. The argument against this strategy is the same one used for GPS EOW rollover: it doesn't belong in the Section 2.3 (i.e. Electronic Mail) mandates because it is not a standard, and if the users of ACP 123 are not aware of this problem, one line in the JTA is not going to help. DISA and the JTADG agreed to include a sentence in the policy section of 2.1.4.1 after the existing narrative on Y2K, rather than include it in Section 2.3, with the understanding that it may still not solve the problem of ACP dependent legacy components that have not yet implemented fixes for				

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				Y2K. b) The JTADG-suggested narrative to be included in Section 2.1.2.2.1 Y2k Compliance is as follows: 'To address the 4-digit year solution by 2006, all 2-digit years greater than '05' will be interpreted as having century digits '19' and all 2-digit years less than or equal to '05' will be interpreted as having the century digits '20'.				
ARMY 1864	3.0 D2	2.3.2.1.5	Keep 3 SEP 1999 text in 2.3.2.1.5 Global Positioning System. Changes made after JTADG for 3 SEP 1999 document are correct. KEF2 (USAF 35) and KEF3 (USAF 36) are not clear; they state that these ICDs should no longer be in the text, yet they are included in the JTA. At the 3 Aug 1999 JTADG it was agreed that these ICDs should be mandated, with a rewrite of the paragraph which had been submitted to the JTADG by the GPS JPO under USAF 34. Continue to include the following ICDs in the GPS section: ICD-GPS-200C, NAVSTAR GPS Space Segment/Navigation User Interfaces, 16 Oct 97. ICD-GPS-222A, NAVSTAR GPS UE Auxiliary Output Chip Interface (U), 26 Apr 96. ICD-GPS-225A, NAVSTAR GPS Selective Availability/Anti-Spoofing Host Application Equipment Design Requirements with the Precise Positioning Service Security Module (U), 12 Mar 98.	The Section 3 WG had been struggling to decide what language to include on GPS. The JPO for GPS had recommended a rewrite of Section 2.3.2.1.5 to include a discussion on PPS and three GPS ICDs (1 Unclassified, 2 Classified). The resolution was to include the rewrite and the ICDs in the JTA, with a caveat in the JTA handbook stating that for GPS only, policy and three ICDs are being mandated. No further ICDs will be included in the GPS section and the JTADG recognized that this is a well thought out exception to JTA policy, and is not to be considered a precedent that would encourage the inclusion of other ICDs in the JTA. Prior to agreeing to this recommendation, the Services had coordinated with the GPS JPO to identify specific standards for Selective Availability and Anti-Spoofing since ICDs are traditionally not appropriate for inclusion in the JTA/JTA-		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				A. No 'standard' could be identified, but ICDs indicating the interfaces between GPS modules/systems and a user's platform are well defined. The language agreed to was as follows: 2.3.2.1.5 Global Positioning System The CJCS (CJCSI 6130.01A, 1998 CJCS Master Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Plan) has declared that the GPS will be the primary radionavigation system source of positioning, navigation and timing (PNT) for the DoD. GPS is a space-based, worldwide, precise positioning, velocity, and timing system. It provides an unlimited number of suitably equipped passive users with a force-enhancing, common-grid, all-weather, continuous, three-dimensional PNT capability. The NAVSTAR GPS provides two levels of service - a Standard Positioning Service (SPS) and a Precise Positioning Service (PPS). The following standard is mandated: ICD-GPS-200C, NAVSTAR GPS Space Segment/Navigation User Interfaces, 16 Oct 97. The PPS was designed primarily for US military use, and the DoD will control access to the PPS through cryptography. DoD GPS users with combat, combat support, or combat service support missions must				

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				acquire and use PPS-capable GPS receivers. The US will enter into special arrangements with military users of allied and friendly governments to allow them use of the PPS. The following standards are mandated: ICD-GPS-222A, NAVSTAR GPS UE Auxiliary Output Chip Interface (U), 26 Apr 96. ICD-GPS-225A, NAVSTAR GPS Selective Availability/Anti-Spoofing Host Application Equipment Design Requirements with the Precise Positioning Service Security Module (U), 12 Mar 98. For additional information associated with the acquisition and use of PPS-capable GPS receivers, including End-of-Week Rollover compliance, and Year 2000 compliance for GPS receivers, consult the GPS JPO at the following Web site: http://gps.losangeles.af.mil.				
ARMY 1865	3.0 D2	2.3.3.1.1	Keep 3 SEP 1999 text in 2.3.3.1.1 Internet Standards. Changes made after JTADG for 3 SEP 1999 document are correct but add full title for RFC 2207 and 2380. Do not include the entire list of RSVP RFCs from the comparison version; only include the RFCs that were agreed to during the 3 Aug 1999 JTADG, i.e. - IETF RFC 2205 Resource ReSerVation Protocol RSVP Version 1. - IETF RFC 2207 RSVP Extensions for IPSEC Data Flows. - IETF RFC 2380 RSVP over ATM Implementation Requirements.	KEF4 (USAF 38) indicated that several of the RSVP standards that were identified in the change request were not implemented. As the 30 June 1999 Database indicates, USAF 38 was labeled as BI (Awaiting input) as of 6/11/99. The Army had take an action to rewrite the QoS section in the emerging standards section to include RSVP and other related QoS standards by 16 Jun 1999. 1. The following re-write was provided to the Section 2.3		AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== Add dates to the three RFCs: RFC 2205 is dated September 1997; RFC 2207 is dated September 1997; RFC 2380 is dated August 1998.	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				lead via email on 16 Jun 1999. Recommendation: Replace existing paragraph on Integrated Services and RSVP with paragraph on Quality of Service: Emerging Standards Section 2.3.3.1.1, Internet Standards Quality of Service (QoS) Quality of Service is the ability of a network to ensure that the predetermined traffic and service requirements of a network element (e.g. end-system, router, application) can be satisfied. Multiple fora including the IETF and IEEE are engaged in this evolving end-to-end networking effort to enhance the current networking architecture with support for QoS. To provide services over the LAN/WAN beyond the current best-effort IP based service, the protocols currently under development to enable end-to-end QoS include: - Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) - Communicates the QoS requirements for a given application to a device in the path of the transmission. A reservation for the required bandwidth is allowed or denied depending on the current network conditions. RSVP is expected to be utilized predominantly in the campus-level networks. Reference IETF proposed standards: RFCs 2205-2207, and 2380. - Differentiated Services (DiffServ)- An emerging Quality of Service				

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				standard which utilizes an entire TOS byte in the IP header, offering up to 256 levels of priority. This protocol is expected to be used predominantly in the IP backbone environments. Reference IETF internet drafts being developed by the IETF Differentiated Services WG at http://www.ietf.org/ids.by.wg/diffserv.html. - Multiprotocol Label Switching (MPLS)- MPLS adds a label containing specific routing information to each IP packet, and specifies ways that Layer 3 traffic can be mapped to connection oriented Layer 2 transports like ATM and Frame relay. Reference IETF internet drafts being developed by the IETF MPLS WG at http://www.ietf.org/ids.by.wg/mpls.html - IEEE 802.1p and IEEE 802.1Q - These IEEE standards specify the traffic classification method used by Ethernet switches, to expedite delivery of time critical traffic . IEEE 802.1p governs the prioritization of packets, offering eight discrete priority levels from the default (best effort) through reserved (highest priority). IEEE 802.1Q defines an additional 4-octet field in the LAN header to support Virtual LANs. 2. During the 3 Aug 1999 JTADG, the WG modified this input to the following: 'Quality of Service Quality of				

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				Service (QoS) is the ability of a network to ensure that the predetermined traffic and service requirements of a network element (e.g., end-system, router, application) can be satisfied. Multiple fora including the IETF and IEEE are engaged in this evolving end-to-end networking effort to enhance the current networking architecture with support for QoS. To provide services over the LAN/WAN beyond the current best-effort IP-based service, the protocols currently under development to enable end-to-end QoS include: Resource Reservation Protocol (RSVP) - Communicates the QoS requirements for a given application to a device in the path of the transmission. A reservation for the required bandwidth is allowed or denied depending on the current network conditions. RSVP is expected to be utilized predominantly in the campus-level networks. The following standards are emerging: - IETF RFC 2205 Resource ReSerVation Protocol RSVP-Version 1.'- IETF RFC 2207 RSVP Extensions for IPSEC Data Flows - IETF RFC 2380 RSVP over ATM Implementation Requirements IEEE 802.1p and IEEE 802.1q - These IEEE standards specify the traffic classification method used by Ethernet switches,				

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				to expedite delivery of time critical traffic. IEEE 802.1p governs the prioritization of packets, offering eight discrete priority levels from the default (best effort) through reserved (highest priority). IEEE 802.1q defines an additional 4-octet field in the LAN header to support Virtual LANs.				
ARMY 1866	3.0 D2	2.3.3.2	Correct by using the most current agreed to text in 2.3.3.2 Network Standards. No technical issue. Although this change is not inaccurate, it was made outside the agreed to configuration control process.	KEF 5 (JEEB 23) indicates that the 6/23/1999 sentence was incorrect. The 30 Jun 1999 database indicates that the 6/23/99 accepted revision included the following 'For bandwidth limited tactical interfaces, the following standard is emerging: Low Speed Circuit Emulation Service (LSCES), af-vtoa-0019.000. The 3 Aug 1999 JTADG had agreed that the format used in the mandates section should be adopted in the emerging standards section for consistency. The change made to the 3 Sep JTA 3.0 narrative is editorial in nature. Whether it is written as:' For bandwidth limited tactical interfaces, the following standard is emerging, - af-vtoa-0119.00, Low Speed Circuit Emulation Service, or 'For bandwidth limited tactical interfaces, Low Speed Circuit Emulation Service, af-vtoa-0119.00 is emerging the narrative is correct.		OBE (Overcome by Events) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army. mil
ARMY 1867	3.0 D2	CS.ATS.2. 2.2 and .2.2.3	Add new '2.2.2.1 Data Interchange Services' and '2.2.3.1 Data Interchange Services' and re-number following paragraphs.	See Army 1635 for JTADG resolution to add text as stated. The mandated and		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				emerging standards should track back to the core Section 2.2.2.2.1.4. The concept is to provide a path up to the core so standards can be moved to provide DoD wide interoperability in the future.			mil	mil
ARMY 1868	3.0 D2	CS.ATS.2.3.2.1	Delete mandate and paragraph CS.ATS.2.3.2.1 since no mandate then exists.	This was not discussed at the JTADG since ATSEA 14 referred to this as editorial, in CS.ATS.3.3.2.1. This is an error. Making a rule a mandate is not appropriate in the JTA, and is not considered editorial. Rules can not be mandated standards. The same problem occurs in CS.ATS.3.3.2.1, see Army ARMY 1869.		AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== Keep text but delete mandate bullet and sentence in preceeding paragraph that reads "The following is mandated in this version of the JTA:" Remove mandate from Appendix B.	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1869	3.0 D2	CS.ATS.3.3.2.1	Delete mandate and paragraph CS.ATS.3.3.2.1 since no mandate then exists.	This was not discussed at the JTADG since ATSEA 14 referred to this as editorial. This is an error. Making a rule a mandate is not appropriate in the JTA, and is not editorial. Rules can not be mandated standards. The same problem occurs in CS.ATS.2.3.2.1. See Army ARMY 1868.		AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== Keep text but delete mandate bullet and sentence in preceeding paragraph that reads "The following is mandated in this version of the JTA:" Remove mandate from Appendix B.	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil
ARMY 1870	3.0 D2	CS.ATS.3.1	Delete Section CS.ATS.3.1 and sun-paragraphs. Re-number following paragraphs.	See Army 1626. The JTADG unanimously voted to accept this comment to remove the entire section 3.1 'Software Engineering Services', but it was not noted in the comment database. See DISA 63 and ATSEA 13 that called for deleting the paragraph.		AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== Keep title for Section CS.ATS.3.1: "Software-Engineering Services." Delete titles and text for subsections CS.ATS.3.1.1 "Introduction"; CS.ATS.3.1.2 "Mandated Standards" and	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil	Alex Osborne alex.osborne @hdqa.army.mil

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
						CS.ATS.3.1.3 "Emerging Standards." Replace with new text: "There are currently no mandates or emerging standards identified in this section."		
ARMY 1871	3.0 D2	CS.ATS.3.3.4	Change title of CS.ATS.3.3.4 to 'Other Interfaces,' as per the JTADG comment resolution.	Change was accepted in Army 1631 as AR.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
NIMA 3201	3.0 D2	2.2.2.2.1.4.1	Document Interchange Date of Amendment 1 to ISO 8879 (SGML) is incorrect - should have date of 1988; NOT 1998 Appendix B is CORRECT and does not need to be fixed	This error also appears in JTA 2.0! Amendment 1 to ISO 8879 has a publish date of 1988 (6/30/88); per www.nssn.org		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3202	3.0 D2	2.2.2.2.1.1 1.2 & 2.2.3.5.2	Distributed Object Computing Currently Mandated Standard There are (2) separate standards included in one bullet (7th) Cut and Paste error made when moving DCE/CORBA to the mandated section; the Negotiation Facility, a separate CORBA standard already agreed to in Emerging, was pasted into this section. There are two separate actions needed to fix this: modify 7th bullet in MANDATED to read: OMG document orbos/98-06-01 ,CORBAservices DCE/CORBA Interworking Service add bullet to section 2.2.3.5.2 (EMERGING) after 4th '-': OMG document ec/98-02-04, Negotiation Facility	This was a cut and paste error made during document revision. The intent was to move DCE/CORBA from mandated to emerging; Negotiation was to remain in emerging.		AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== See Section 2.2.3.5.2 for preferred format for mandated OMG standards.	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3203	3.0 D2	2.2.2.2.1.1 1.2	Distributed Object Computing Revise dates on CORBA Services as indicated in accepted NIMA comments NIMA 2014; Subgroup status 'A' on 11/30/1998 at 10:33AM CORBAservices Naming Service, OMG document formal/97-12-10 CORBAservices Event Service, OMG document formal/97-12-11 CORBAservices Transaction Service, OMG document formal/97-12-17 NIMA 2021; Subgroup status 'A' on 11/30/1998 at 10:26AM OMG document formal/97-12-21: CORBAservices - Time Service OMG document formal/97-12-23: CORBAservices - Trading Object Service	NIMA comments were accepted during the first JTA 3.0 review cycle but never incorporated into the document. These are the current, public versions of these specifications. The older documents which appear in the 3 September 1999 version of the JTA are no longer publicly available (a key JTA criteria) and there will not be commercially available products supporting these older		AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== Remove the following text from each mandate: "…contained in CORBAservices: Common Object Services Specification, 05 July 1998." Note: The number following the slash after "document formal" is a URL sequence	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				versions by the time the JTA is published in November.		identification number, not the date the standard was published.		
NIMA 3204	3.0 D2	2.2.2.2.1.1 1.2	Distributed Object Computing Fix erroneous date format on CORBA 2.3 specification (lst bullet) Correct date is 98-12-01 (Not 011 for day)	Typo error during JTA core revision		AR (Accept Revision) 11/01/1999 ========== 98-12-01, 1 February 1998.	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3205	3.0 D2	APP B	Doc Interchange Extraneous text in 'Emerging Standard' column; does not appear to be related to subject standard			W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3206	3.0 D2	APP B	Geospatial Data Interchange MIL-STD-2411 is incorrectly referenced: 1.) Incorrect version number on MIL-STD-2411. There is no published '2411A' as indicated in the appendix. (NOTE: The JTA Core is correct (i.e. 2411) 2.) RPF is not a direct profile of NITF 2.0	Use standard citation as it appears in the JTA core to fix this		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3207	3.0 D2	APP B	Still Imagery Data Interchange Previously Mandated Standard column MIL-STD-2500A There is an extraneous word of text ('same') which appears prior to the listed standard.			A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3208	3.0 D2	APP B	Still Imagery Data Interchange Previously Mandated Standard column MIL-STD 2301 There is extraneous text which appears AFTER the listed standard. All text after 18 June 1993 should be deleted	Cut and paste error; should have been a replacement instead of an append…		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3209	3.0 D2	APP B	Still Imagery Data Interchange Previously Mandated Standard column MIL-STD 188-198A There is an extraneous word of text ('same') which appears prior to the listed standard.			A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3210	3.0 D2	APP B	Video Imagery Previous Mandated Standard ISO/IEC 13818-1 Should be same reference as the mandated standard WITH THE EXCEPTION of the Amendment 1 (1997).	JTA 2.0 mandate was ISO/IEC 13818-1,2,4: 1996		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3211	3.0 D2	APP B	Video Imagery Previous Mandated Standard ISO/IEC 13818-2 Should be same reference as the mandated standard WITH THE EXCEPTION of the Amendment 1 (1997).	JTA 2.0 mandate was ISO/IEC 13818-1,2,4: 1996		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3212	3.0 D2	APP B	Video Imagery Previous Mandated Standard ISO/IEC 13818-4 Should be same reference as the mandated standard (Should say 'Same')	JTA 2.0 mandate was ISO/IEC 13818-1,2,4: 1996		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3213	3.0 D2	APP B	Video Imagery Previous Mandated Standard	Mandate has been updated		W (Withdrawn)	Andrew	Andrew

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			ANSI/SMPTE 259M-1993 is the JTA 2.0 mandate.	since JTA 2.0		11/01/1999 ==========	Sellman	Sellman
NIMA 3214	3.0 D2	APP B	Remote Procedure Computing 2.2.2.2.1.2.11.1 Previously Mandated Standard column ALL (3) standards in this section have both the name of the JTA 2.0 mandate AND the word 'Same' in this column. Delete the word 'same' from all three columns for all three standards since the standard citation is not the same as the one used for the current JTA 3.0 mandate	Column includes both a standard name AND the word 'same'		W (Withdrawn) 11/15/1999 ========== A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3215	3.0 D2	APP B	Distributed Object Computing2.2.2.2.1.11.2 Previously Mandated Standard column CORBA Specification There is extraneous text after the previous mandate; delete all text after '… 1 September 1997'.	This is a cut and paste error; should have been a replace instead of an append.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3216	3.0 D2	APP B	Distributed Object Computing2.2.2.2.1.11.2 Previously Mandated Standard column The first (3) CORBAservices (Naming, Event, Transaction) have a cut and paste error in the Previously Mandated Standard Column. This column currently includes the JTA 2.0 information (first) + the JTA 3.0 information (second). To fix this; in all three occurrences please delete all text from the beginning up to the words '…Volume 2'. All words after those are the correct ones.	This is a cut and paste error; should have been a replace instead of an append.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3217	3.0 D2	APP B	Host Standards 2.3.2.1.1 Previously Mandated Standard column Should be 'Same'			A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3218	3.0 D2	APP B	VTC Stds 2.3.2.1.2 Previously Mandated Standard column and & Comments column There are several separate JTA 2.0 VTC standards that have now been incorporated into the FTR VTC profile. These standards, listed separately in JTA 2.0, are H.281, H.224, and G.728. These need to appear a separate mandates in the Previously Mandated Standard column with a note in the comments field that they are now part of the new FTR.	The Previously mandated standard column MUST include ALL JTA 2.0 mandated standards; not just selective ones that happen to match JTA 3.0 service categories.		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3219	3.0 D2	APP B	VTC Stds 2.3.2.1.2 Extraneous row after FTR standard should be deleted (after FTR comment text is moved up)			W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3220	3.0 D2	APP B	Check Font style and size for this section and all others. These are not uniform.	Font Style and Size should be consistent throughout the		A (Accept) 11/01/1999	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
				Appendix.		==========		
NIMA 3221	3.0 D2	APP B	Section Number is incorrect; as is all service area headings. 19 October doc says Section 6.	Appendix B section and service area numbering should be consistent with the JTA core		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3222	3.0 D2	APP B	Domain-level Style Guides 2.5.2.2.3 Currently Mandated Standard Appendix B has the incorrect version for the DII User Interface Spec. It should be version 3.0, Feb 1998 (as it is shown in the JTA core)	Appendix B mandates must match JTA core.		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3223	3.0 D2	APP B	Emerging Standards GeoSym is an EMERGING standard; not a Current mandate as shown in the table. Move GeoSym text to the emerging standard column	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA core		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3224	3.0 D2	APP B	X-Window Style Guide Previously Mandated Standard TriTeal Enterprise Desktop (TED) 4.0 Style Guide, Revision 1.2 (OSF 1992) is missing from the Previously Mandated Standard column	The Previously mandated standard column MUST include ALL JTA 2.0 mandated standards ; not just selective ones that happen to match JTA 3.0 service categories.		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3225	3.0 D2	APP B	Security Algorithms Currently Mandated Standard The date in Appendix B for FIPS 186-1 does not match the JTA core. The correct date is now December 1998	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA core		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3226	3.0 D2	APP B	Security Algorithms Previous Mandated Standard JTA 2.0 does not call out FIPS 185; instead it calls out R21-TECH-044, 21 May 1991.	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3227	3.0 D2	APP B	Common Data Link Stds Previously Mandated Standard System Spec for CDL Should say 'Same' Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3228	3.0 D2	APP B	Common Data Link Stds Previously Mandated Standard System Descrip Doc for CDL Should say 'Same' Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3229	3.0 D2	APP B	MASINT Sensor Comm Stds Previously Mandated Standard SEIWG-005 Should say 'same' Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)					
NIMA 3230	3.0 D2	APP B	Target/Threat Data Interchange Previously Mandated Standard NTSDS Database Impl Descrip. Should say 'N/A' These standards are new to C4ISR & were not addressed in JTA 2.0	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3231	3.0 D2	APP B	Target/Threat Data Interchange Previously Mandated Standard NTSDS Supp. Schema Def. Should say 'N/A' These standards are new to C4ISR & were not addressed in JTA 2.0	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3232	3.0 D2	APP B	Navigation, Geospatial Previously Mandated Standard SNU-84-1 Should say 'same' Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3233	3.0 D2	APP B	Vehicle/Sensor Telemetry Previously Mandated Standard IRIG 106-96 Should say 'same' Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3234	3.0 D2	APP B	Mission Recorder Previously Mandated Standard DCRSi 240 Should say 'same' Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3235	3.0 D2	APP B	Mission Recorder Previously Mandated Standard ANSI X.3.175 Should say 'same' Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3236	3.0 D2	APP B	Mission Recorder IRIG 104-70 Previously Mandated Standard Should list the JTA 2.0 mandate from C4ISR.AR - Instrumentation Group (IRIG) B format as defined in IRIG document 104-70 August 1970 Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3237	3.0 D2	APP B	Fibre Channel Previously Mandated Standard column ANSI X3.230 Should list the JTA 2.0 mandate from C4ISR.AR (ANSI	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			X3.230, Jan 1996 Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)					
NIMA 3238	3.0 D2	APP B	FireWire Previously Mandated Standard column IEEE 1394 Should say 'N/A' This is a new C4ISR standard and is also new to Airborne Recon.			W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3239	3.0 D2	APP B	'Dropped' C4ISR.AR mandated standards Previously Mandated Standard column Here are (6) Airborne Reconnaissance standards, which appeared in the JTA 2.0 Airborne Recon Annex to the C4ISR domain annex. These standards MUST appear in the previously mandated standard column of the C4ISR domain annex so JTA users understand that if they were required to comply with these standards for JTA 2.0, they no longer must do so for JTA 3.0 The (6) standards are: Common Imagery Ground/Surface System (CIGSS) Acquisition Standards Handbook, Version 1, 19 July 1995. Joint Airborne SIGINT Architecture Standards Handbook, Version 2.0, 30 October 1997. Kalman filtering for navigation and timing, as originally defined in Kalman, R.E., A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems, Trans. ASME, Series D, J. Basic Eng., V. 82, March 1960. MIL-STD-1553B, Notice 4, Department of Defense Interface Standard for Digital Time Division Command/Response Multiplex Data Bus, 15 January 1996. ANSI X3.184, Information Systems - Fiber Distributed Data Interface (FDDI) Single-Mode Fiber Physical Layer Medium Dependent (SMF-PMD) (100 Mb/s dual counter rotating ring), 1 January 1993. FIPS PUB 10-4: April 1995, Countries, Dependencies, Areas of Special Sovereignty, Municipal Divisions. Add note to Comments field that this standard previously appeared in the Airborne Reconnaissance Annex (C4ISR.AR)	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3240	3.0 D2	APP B	'Dropped' C4ISR.AR mandated standards Previously Mandated Standard column Here	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			are (4) Airborne Reconnaissance standards that appeared in the JTA 2.0 Airborne Recon Annex to the C4ISR domain annex. The (4) standards are: TCS RPP design requirements are contained within the TCS RPP Software Requirements Specification Version 1.0, 14 November 1997 (TCS Document Control Number: TCS-303). The Tactical Control System (TCS) Flight Route Plan to Tactical Control System, Version 1.0 Interface Design Description (IDD), (TCS Document Control Number: TCS-244, 1 October 1997, provides the standard Flight Route and Payload Plan file format to be used for compatibility with the TCS RPP and TCS Core Software. TCS SDD 117, Tactical Control System (TCS) Software Design Description (SDD), Version 1.0, 31 March 1997 (TCS Document Control Number: TCS-117). TCS JII 2, Tactical Control System Joint Interoperability Interface 2 (JII 2) - Tactical Control System to Service Command, Control, Communications, Computers and Intelligence (C4I) Systems, Version 1.0, 9 May 1997 (TCS Document Control Number: TCS-233).	mandate)		==========		
NIMA 3241	3.0 D2	APP B	'Dropped' C4ISR.AR mandated standards Previously Mandated Standard column Here is (1) Airborne Reconnaissance standards that appeared in the JTA 2.0 Airborne Recon Annex to the C4ISR domain annex. The standard is: TCS IDD 229, Tactical Control System Segment to Air Vehicle Standard Segment Interface (TCS AVSI) Interface Design Description (IDD), Version 1.2, 29 August 1997 (TCS Document Control Number: TCS-229).	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3242	3.0 D2	APP B	CS 2.2.2.3 Product Data Interchange Previously mandated Standard ISO/IEC 10303 (STEP) This standard was mandated in JTA 2.0; but was moved to emerging in JTA 3.0 because of lack of implementations. there should be a row in Product Data Interchange listing STEP as a Previously Mandated Standard (suggest at the end of	Appendix B not consistent with the JTA 2.0 (previous mandate)		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			the section after BC-1). And there should be a note in the comments field that this standard has been moved to emerging in JTA 3.0					
NIMA 3243	3.0 D2	APP B	CS 2.2.3.1 Product Data Interchange Emerging Standard ISO/IEC 10303 (STEP) This standard was mandated in JTA 2.0; but was moved to emerging in JTA 3.0 because of lack of implementations. the initial part of the standard specification is cut off. Most of the reference is missing (see JTA core, 2.2.3.1). The comments column of this reference should ALSO contain a note that this standard was mandated in 3.0, but was moved because of implementation issues	Appendix B not consistent with JTA 3.0 core Move from mandate to emerging need explanation		A (Accept) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
NIMA 3244	3.0 D2	APP B	EDI /CS 2.2.2.4 Previously mandated standard The FIPS 161-2 profile of ANSI ASC X12 and ISO UN/EDIFACT mandates are unchanged since JTA 2.0. both fields should say 'Same'. However, HL7 has been moved to Medical; but it is still within the CS Annex. HL7 should be added as a CS 2.2.2.4 previous mandate with a note in the comments field that indicates it is still a JTA mandate, but within CS Medical	Appendix B not consistent with JTA 2.0 mandates		W (Withdrawn) 11/01/1999 ==========	Andrew Sellman	Andrew Sellman
OASD 01	3.0 D2	1.0	Change first sentence in first paragraph in Section 1 on page 25 to read: "Warfighter battlespace is complex and dynamic, requiring timely and informed decisions by all levels of military command."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ========== 10 JTADG members voted to defer all Section 1.0 changes until JTA Version 4.0; 5 members voted to accept changes in Version 3.0		
OASD 02	3.0 D2	1.0	Change second sentence in second paragraph in Section 1 on page 25 to read: "They must be able to obtain and use intelligence from national, theater, and coalition assets that may be widely geographically dispersed."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 03	3.0 D2	1.0	Replace Figure 1-1 with attached. (SEE OASD03_FIG1-1)			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 04	3.0 D2	1.0	Change "permits" in second line in first paragraph on page 26 to "facilitates."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
OASD 05	3.0 D2	1.0	Change third bullet in paragraph before paragraph 1.1 on page 26 to read "Standardized Information-transfer capabilities to ensure seamless communications within and across diverse media."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 06	3.0 D2	1.1.1	Change first sentence in paragraph 1.1.1 on page 26 to read "A foremost objective of the JTA is to improve and facilitate the ability of our systems to support joint and combined operations within an overall business case investment strategy."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 07	3.0 D2	1.1.1	Change second bullet in paragraph 1.1.1 on page 26 to read "Mandates IT standards and guidelines for DoD system development and acquisition that will facilitate standardization and interoperability in joint and coalition force operations. These standards are to be applied in concert with DoD standards reform."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 08	3.0 D2	1.1.2	Change next to last sentence in paragraph 1.1.2 on page 27 to read "The JTA is critical to achieving the envisioned objective of a cost-effective, seamlessly integrated environment."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 09	3.0 D2	1.1.3	Replace paragraph totally with "The use of applicable JTA mandated standards, is required for all emerging capabilities, or changes to an existing capability that produces, uses, or exchanges information in any form electronically; crosses a functional or DoD Component boundary; and gives the warfighter or DoD decision maker an operational capability. Implementation of the JTA is required for all DoD Acquisition Catagories, and all other non-traditional (e.g., Defense Information Infrastructure (DII) Common Operating Environment (COE)), systemic (e.g., Joint Airborne SIGINT Architecture (JASA)), or non-DoD 5000 series acquisitions (e.g., procurement of Information Technology services, CINC Initiatives) that meet these criteria. In addition, implementation of the JTA is required for pre-acquisition programs such as: Advanced Concept Technology			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			Demonstration (ACTDs), Advanced Technology Demonstrations (ATDs), Joint Warrior Interoperability Demonstrations (JWIDs), 'Exploitation-year', and Battle Laboratory projects that meet these criteria. The mandatory standards in the JTA must be implemented or used by systems that have a need for the corresponding service areas. A standard is mandatory in the sense that if a service/interface is going to be implemented, it shall be implemented in accordance with the mandated standard. If a required service can be obtained by implementing more than one standard (e.g., operating-system standards), the appropriate standard should be selected based on system requirements. If a system or capability does not have a need for a service, the standard(s) mandated in the JTA for that service need not be implemented.					
OASD 10	3.0 D2	1.1.4	In paragraph 1.1.4 on page 28, the second complete paragraph, the last line, change "upgraded" to "upgrading."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 11	3.0 D2	1.1.4	In paragraph 1.1.4 on page 28, the third complete paragraph, change the last sentence to read "The applicability and scope of Version 2.0 of the JTA was expanded to include the information technology in all DoD systems."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 12	3.0 D2	1.1.4	In paragraph 1.1.4 on page 28, change the fourth complete paragraph to read "JTA Version 3.0 development began in June 1998. JTA Version 3.0 includes additional subdomain annexes and incorporates the newly developed DoD Technical Reference Model (DoD TRM). JTA Version 3.0 attempts to integrate references to standards throughout the document in an automated fashion with reference information found in Appendix B."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 13	3.0 D2	1.1.5	Replace Figure 1-2 on page 29 with the attached. (SEE OASD13_FIGURE1-2)			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 14	3.0 D2	1.1.5.4	Change the title of paragraph 1.1.5.4 on			A (Accept)		

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			page 30 to read "Relationship Between the C4ISR Architecture Framework 2.0 and the DoD JTA			11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 15	3.0 D2	1.1.5.4	Replace paragraph 1.1.5.4 on page 30 with "The C4ISR Architecture Framework (CAF) defines the technical architecture view and a set of standard technical products for DoD use. The JTA is one of the Universal Reference Resources named in the CAF. The JTA is the primary source document to the essential and supporting Technical Architecture products defined in the C4ISR Architecture Framework. Standards chosen from the JTA and other sources to meet system and operational requirements form the Technical Architecture View."			AR (Accept revised) 11/01/1999 ========== See ARMY 1820.		
OASD 16	3.0 D2	1.2.3	Change to the first sentence in paragraph 1.2.3 on page31 to read "The JTA Core contains the common service areas, interfaces, and standards (JTA elements) applicable to all DoD systems to support standardization and interoperability."			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 17	3.0 D2	1.2.3	Change the last paragraph on page 31 in paragraph 1.2.3 to "The JTA domain annexes contain domain-specific JTA elements applicable within the specified family of systems, to further support standardization and interoperability within the systems represented in the domain in addition to those included in the JTA Core. Domains may be composed of multiple subdomains. Subdomains represent the decomposition of a domain (referred to as the subdomain's parent domain) into a subset of related systems, exploiting additional commonalities and addressing variances within the domain. Subdomain annexes contain domain-specific JTA elements applicable within the specified family of systems, to further support standardization and interoperability within the systems represented in the subdomain in addition to those included in the JTA Core and in the parent domain annex. The relationships between the JTA Core, domain annexes, and subdomain annexes currently			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			included in the JTA are illustrated in Figure 1-3."					
OASD 18	3.0 D2	1.2.3	Change "annex" in paragraph 1.2.3 in the first paragraph after Figure 1-3 to "annexes"			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		
OASD 19	3.0 D2	1.3	Replace paragraph 1.3 to "In general, the JTA is used to determine the mandated standards within applicable service areas for implementation within new or upgrading systems. The JTA service areas are based on the DoD TRM. For a more complete description of the DoD TRM and service areas, refer to Section 2.1.2.1. The JTA is a forward-looking document. It guides the acquisition and development of new and emerging functionality and provides a baseline toward which existing systems will move. It is a compendium of standards (for interfaces/services) that should be used now and in the future. It is NOT a catalog of all information-technology standards used within today's DoD systems. If legacy standards are needed to interface with existing systems, they can be implemented on a case-by-case basis in addition to the mandated standard. Legacy standards are those standards that are not currently mandated in the JTA and have been chosen for implementation or implemented in systems that have passed the design freeze point in their life-cycles. If cited, requirements documents not identified in the JTA should complement, and not conflict with, the JTA Core and applicable domain and subdomain annexes. The JTA shall be used by anyone involved in the management, development, or acquisition of new or improved systems within DoD. Specific guidance for implementing the JTA will be provided in separate DoD Component JTA implementation plans. Operational requirements developers shall be cognizant of the JTA in developing requirements and functional descriptions. System developers shall use the JTA to facilitate the achievement of interoperability			D (Do not accept) 11/01/1999 ==========		

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)

Sponsor & Number	JTA Version	JTA Section	Change Request and Suggested Revision	Rationale	Subgroup Recommended Action	JTADG Approval Action	From Whom?	Sent by
			for new and upgrading systems (and the interfaces to such systems). System integrators shall use it to foster the integration of existing and new systems. Each DoD Component and cognizant OSD authority is responsible for implementation of the JTA, to include compliance assurance, programming and budgeting of resources, and scheduling. Use of an applicable JTA mandated standard must consider the cost, schedule, or performance impacts, and if warranted a waiver from use granted. Only the Component Acquisition Executive, or cognizant OSD authority can grant a waiver from the use of an applicable JTA mandated standard. All waivers shall be submitted to the USD(A&T) and ASD(C3I) (the DoD Chief Information Officer (CIO)) for concurrence. Both USD(A&T) and ASD(C3I) (DoD CIO) concurrence can be assumed if no response is received two weeks after the date of receipt. All requests for waiver must be accompanied by the identification of cost, schedule, and performance impacts that will occur if waiver is not granted. To preclude the granting of duplicative waivers, caused by implementing this and other OSD mandates, the organization responsible for systemic implementations of the JTA (that is: DISA for DII COE; NSA for the JASA; BMDO for the standards in the Missile Defense subdomain, and DMSO for the standards in the Modeling and Simulation domain) will review all requests for waiver within their respective domains, and forward said requests with their recommendation to USD(A&T) and ASD(C3I) for concurrence. "					

A (Accept) AR (Accept Revision) BH (Refer to JTA Handbook) BI (Awaiting Input) BJ (Refer to JTADG) BT (Refer to TASG) C (Defer to later version)
D (Do Not Accept) DUP (Duplicate) E (Out of scope) HEAD DUP OBE (Overcome by Events) W (Withdrawn)